

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT JOHNSON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CHARLES YUAM, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 20-cv-08542-SVK

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF  
REQUESTING EXTENSION OF TIME  
TO COMPLETE SERVICE ON  
DEFENDANT**

Re: Dkt. No. 8

Before the Court is Plaintiff's administrative motion requesting a 90-day extension of the time to complete service on Defendant. Dkt. 8. In support of the motion, Plaintiff's counsel submits a declaration stating under oath that her office has "reason to believe that we can complete service shortly." Dkt. 8-1 ¶ 11. This verbiage is standard in all declarations in support of an extension of time to complete service received from Plaintiff's counsel. If the statement under oath is accurate, then Plaintiff does not need an additional 90 days for service. If the statement under oath is not accurate, then it should never appear in another declaration before this Court. In this instance, the Court presumes that the statement is accurate and therefore Plaintiff's request for a 90-day extension of time to complete service—on top of the original 60 days Plaintiff had to complete service—is unreasonable. The Court grants Plaintiff an additional **30 days from the date of this order** to complete service.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 2, 2021



SUSAN VAN KEULEN  
United States Magistrate Judge